



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

THE JOURNAL OF GERMANIC PHILOLOGY. Edited by GUSTAF E. KARSTEN. Vol. I, 1897. Numbers 2, 3 and 4.

The first volume of the *Journal of Germanic Philology* has in these three numbers fully realized the expectations which its first number had aroused. The various articles show a broad range of interest and a spirit of thorough scholarship which are a credit to the general scholarship of this country and promise well for the future of the *Journal*.

The second number opens with an article by Elisabeth Woodbridge (Yale University) on Chaucer's Classicism (pp. 111-17). Miss Woodbridge discusses the essence of classicism and romanticism, and adopts as a description of the former the view of Brunetière (*Études Critiques*, vol. III, 202), and finds in Pater (*Appreciations*, p. 248) the 'most far-reaching and psychologically adequate suggestion (of the essence of romanticism) that we can find,' though allowing that both tendencies may be united in one individual. Chaucer, judged by his works merely, is possibly outside the pale of classicism as defined by Brunetière. For the English language of Chaucer's time had not yet reached the 'classic stage,' that is 'perfection,' and 'freed from foreign influences.' Besides, in Chaucer's works there is a lack of architectural proportion. Again, he was not a reactionary against the earlier conventions which might be called romantic. On the other hand, though Chaucer took as his themes 'romantic themes' narrowly so called, yet his attitude towards them shows 'shrewdness' and 'composed comfortable genius,' which are qualities never properly attributed to a romanticist pure and simple. The article sums up in these words: "If he had lived in the days of romanticism he might have been outwardly tinged by it . . . but a true romanticist he could hardly have been."

Pp. 118-35. Ewald Flügel (Stanford University), *Some Notes on Chaucer's Prologue*, contributes some "selections from a great number of 'Chaucerania' consisting of new parallels, textual emendations, and explanatory matter, collected in the course of my work at the CHAUCER LEXICON." The notes thus contributed deal with vv. 1-9; 9-10; 60; 91; Chaucer and 'Nembrot,' v. 177; vv. 212 and 248, all of the Prologue. The new parallels were 'yielded mainly by a verbal concordance to Gower's *Confessio Amantis* and a word-index to Wycliffe's *Minor Writings*.'

Pp. 136-219. George H. McKnight (Cornell University), *The Primitive Teutonic Order of Words*. The author defines the method by which he proposes to make a collation of all known facts and results known about Teutonic Order of Words and to establish his conclusions. There is a twofold meaning in the phrase 'order of words,' which refers either to a subjective or to an objective movement, to the order in which thought elements receive expression or to the relative position of the essential terms of a proposition. The subjective order is generally in the progression of ideas from the known to the unknown, from the 'psychological subject' which comes first to the 'psychological predicate' which comes last. Subjective word-order is influenced by the nature of the clause; imperative clauses differ from affirmative clauses in their nature and hence in order, as do principal and subordinate clauses. Emphasis is a potent influence in shaping subjective word-order and so is force, but clearness exercises the 'most potent influence.' Clearness is promoted by putting next to each other words connected in thought; hence the arrangement of words in a clause 'is determined primarily by the nearness of their relation to each other.' Analogy also influences word-order, and so does style, the order of prose being quite different from that of poetry, which employs mostly the 'pathetic order.' These factors determine word-order in all languages.

'Order of words' may denote an objective movement, referring to the relative positions of the three essentials of a sentence, viz. *subject, object, predicate*. Order of words in this sense is the subject of the discussion. In uninflected languages this order shows syntactical relations, while in inflected languages a traditional order will gradually establish itself and become fixed. The general principles of 'emphasis,' 'clearness' and 'force' above enumerated operate within the restraints of such a fixed order. The recent investigations of Wunderlich and Braune do not cover the ground which the author intends to investigate, for the problem proposed is: "Did not this freedom of position (established by Braune's investigation of the position of the verb in a clause) exist within the restraint of a fixed order of syntactical terms?" As I.E. in its earliest stages was probably uninflected, the order of syntactical relations was probably not free. The most natural order is that of the language of the deaf and dumb, *subject, object, verb*. The evidence of verbal forms in I.E. shows that the predicate precedes the subject, while in compounds the object precedes the predicate. Hence the primitive order is *object, predicate, subject*. In the earliest monuments, particularly Lat. and Lith., the predicate came last, a fact substantiated by O.Pers. and Sk., though in Gk., Russ., Armen. and Celt. traces of this order are few. In Sk. and Lat. the relative position of subject and object was variable, but the tendency was to place the *subject* before the *object* and then followed the *predicate*. In

principal propositions, in order to distinguish them from subordinate propositions, the primitive order was inverted, and 'to the type of order, then, *object, predicate, subject*, may be added a second type, probably used concurrent with the first, and probably soon becoming dominant, *subject, object, predicate*.' This theory of the final position of the verb is supported by Delbrück (*Syntaktische Forschungen*, IV), so that all evidence *à priori* and *à posteriori* points to the position of the verb at the end of a clause. This position would also be expected in Teutonic order, since Teutonic 'could hardly have been independent of the parent language in this matter.'

The writer then proceeds to investigate the internal evidence, taking up first Gothic, which presents material of but little value, since Gothic is such a faithful reproduction of the Greek, and even the Skeireins may be a translation from the Latin. The conclusions of a careful study of available materials are: "On the whole we must conclude that the Gothic order of words was by no means rigidly fixed . . . On the other hand, in both works (Skeireins and the Bible) there is a manifest fondness for the synthetic order. The governing word, noun or verb, usually comes after the governed word, thus binding the parts of the expression into a closely united whole."

In the study of Old High German order of words, McKnight takes the results established by others, but formulates them more conveniently for reference and comparison with results obtained independently in Gothic and Old English. The results of such comparison lead to the conclusion: "we must infer that at the time when the earliest works that have descended to us were composed, there already existed a feeling for the difference between principal and subordinate clauses, expressed by a difference in word-order. . . . O.H.G., then, does not afford us much direct evidence as to the order of words in primitive Teutonic."

The order of words in Old Norse the author is obliged to treat inadequately because of the limitations of the article, the lack of former investigations and the unsatisfactory character of the materials for study. In the younger Edda the order of words is much like that of the English, with some striking exceptions. The study of the Runic inscriptions, though slender, 'shows that the synthetic order was the earliest, and that the order of words characteristic of literary Icelandic does not belong to primitive Teutonic.'

Ries furnishes the statistics for the order of words in O.S. The tendency is to the employment of the normal order, though the inverted order is nearly as common. In subordinate sentences 70 per cent. of the instances separate subject and verb. In O.E. many statistics have been furnished by other investigators, while McKnight presents the results of his studies in Alfred's and Cnut's Code. In early O.E. the differentiation between principal and subordinate clauses was not strongly marked, and in the later

(prose) works is barely holding its own. The general conclusion of the detailed investigation by Dr. McKnight is that from the very beginning 'each dialect differed from the others, not only in phonology and inflections, but also in word-order.' In O.H.G. principal clauses are distinguished from subordinate, in O.E. this is not the case, while in O.N. a peculiar tendency to invert is discernible even in the primitive inscriptions. As to the relative position of subject and finite verb, the original word-order in affirmative clauses of primitive Teutonic is direct, the verb following directly after the subject. Inversion is difficult of explanation; 'all that can be asserted is that it is an order of words occurring side by side with the direct order in all the early Teutonic dialects.' An explanation for certain cases of inversion is to be found in the nature of a clause, in emphasis or connection. The development of inversion was different in different dialects. As to the position of the verb with relation to its dependencies, it is to be noticed that in all Teutonic dialects the verb, in both principal and subordinate clauses, may be separated from its subject; the older the monument, the more frequent the separation in principal clauses. McKnight agrees with Behagel that in primitive Teutonic the verb was at the end, a belief confirmed by the evidence from cognate I.E. languages. The analytic order was developed by the growth of sentences in complexity, which tended to make the verbal nouns and adjectives the bearers of the principal thought, and to make the verb more and more colorless, often reducing it to a mere copula. Hence the verb lost its claim to the position of emphasis at the end of a clause. The differentiation between principal and subordinate clauses noted by Ries in his study of Beowulf and Heliand substantiates this theory. Summing up, "from the evidence of cognate I.E. languages, from the general direction of the development within Teutonic, and from the tendencies common to all early Teutonic languages, viz. 1) the position of elements in compounds, especially the position of the inseparable prefix, 2) the frequent end-position of the verb even in principal clauses, more frequent the farther back we go, and 3) the fondness for synthetic order;— from all this evidence I conclude that in primitive Teutonic, in affirmative clauses, which were probably of the very simplest nature, the normal position of the verb was after its dependencies."

Pp. 220–38. Hermann Collitz (Bryn Mawr College), *Der Name der Goten bei Griechen und Römer*. This article 1) discusses the origin of the *o* in the Greek and Latin spelling of the name of the Goths, and 2) criticizes and refutes the theory advanced by Osthoff and Streitberg that the so-called *a-Umlaut* of *u* to *o* goes back to the '*gemeingermanische Zeit*.' In the period preceding 200 A. D. the Goths are mentioned by contemporary writers six times. Only three cases, as Collitz shows, are of value as testimony: 1) *Gutones* (Plin.), 2) *Gotones* or *Gothones* (Tac.), 3)

ῥύθωνες, i. e. Gythones (Marinus cited by Ptol.). Of these Plin. is correct, while Tac. and Ptol. attempted to reproduce the short German *u* sound in Latin and Greek. Tac. either did not know that the spelling of Plin. was correct, or else in transcribing the name the change might have been made. A later scribe might have made the change, or, since there is only one original MS of the Germania and one of the first six books of the Annals, both of the XVth century when the name of Goths was spelled with an *o*, it is not at all certain that we have Tacitus's correct spelling. In the period during which the Goths were settled on the Lower Danube the name occurs more frequently in the Gk. form ῥόρθοι, Lat. *Gothi*, other spellings being rare and isolated. Collitz proves by a number of arguments that the Goths called themselves *Gutōs*, and that the Roman spelling *Gothi* was due to the pronunciation of the Greeks, who generally represent short *u* by *o*, as their alphabet lacked that sound. The *th* (Gk. *τθ*) in *Gothi* and the form *Gothones* are uncertain as to origin. Streitberg and Osthoff claim that the Latin spelling with *o* is the older form and that this proves that an *a-Umlaut* existed in earlier Gothic, the later Gothic changing back to *Gutones*. According to Collitz, even if Tacitus's spelling is the one he wrote, there is no evidence that he visited the Goths, nor is it probable that he heard the name from a Goth in Rome; but more probably he obtained his information from some West German in Rome, in whose dialect the *a-Umlaut* was effective. Collitz also shows that Streitberg's theory, when examined in the light of chronology, becomes absurd and absolutely untenable.

Pp. 239-46. H. Schmidt-Wartenberg (University of Chicago), The Berlin Fragment of the Madelghijs. A Middle-Low-Franconian fragment in the Royal Library at Berlin, containing two partly mutilated quarto sheets, belonging to the XIVth century and written by one hand, is identified as a Low Franconian translation of the *Maugis d'Aigremont*. This translation is known only in fragments already published by N. de Pauw. The Berlin fragment is an independent copy, which the author has supplemented from other fragments. The fragment of 342 vv. with minor lacunae follows.

Pp. 247-8. A. S. Cook (Yale University), Christ 77, an emendation of line 77 by substituting *môt* (= mote, atom) for *mōd*.

Pp. 249-51. H. Schmidt-Wartenberg (University of Chicago), Conrad Vollstatter's Gedicht von des Teufel's Töchtern. A reprint of a short poem, 'Von des tûfels töchtern, der sibem waren,' found in a codex in the Royal Library at Berlin. It was written by Conrat Vollstatter, probably a Bavarian, who, however, amounts to nothing as a poet. The poem is shown to be a fragment, and a number of similar versions in German, Italian and French are cited.

No. 3.

Pp. 273-80. Albert S. Cook (Yale University), The College Teaching of English. The object of this article is to suggest rather than to elaborate a theory of teaching English. After showing that such teaching has two ends in view, the elevation of the individual and the advancement of 'the great ends of communal, civic and national life,' and discussing how these ends are attained, the writer makes the following practical suggestions for teaching English effectively. 1. Organization with a clearly defined and comprehensive purpose, in which all members of the teaching body should co-operate in broad sympathy. 2. A unity in the teaching of the three main branches: literature, language and rhetoric. 3. A sufficiently large staff of equally well-trained instructors, but of different ages, temperaments and special inclinations. 4. The topics treated should 'denote an approximately homogeneous content,' and 5. should be arranged in a rational and self-consistent plan. 6. The method employed should secure the co-operation of every student at every stage of its progress; preferably the topical method of investigation to be employed with only occasional formal lectures; also occasional supplementary courses for 'mere entertainment or information.' 7. Every teacher should be an investigator who publishes the result of his labors from time to time, and ought therefor to have leisure for the acquisition and development of scholarship. 8. Every student should have an opportunity to study English throughout the whole of every year of his college course.

Pp. 280-309. Francis A. Wood (Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa), Indo-European Root-Formation. The author, following out the method of root-analysis suggested by Per Persson in his *Studien zur Lehre von der Wurzelerweiterung und Wurzelvariation*, tries to establish the principle that the large number of roots with the same meaning in various I.E. languages may be reduced to a comparatively small number of roots, for the most part monosyllables beginning with a vowel, and that all suffixes and prefixes may also be reduced to such roots. This principle, if established, would change entirely the explanation of the verbal augment, the reduplication and vowel gradation. He treats first of nominal and verbal suffixes. These are connected with demonstrative basal roots, which are likewise the bases of personal pronouns. A second set of suffixes are 'not of pronominal origin, or at least not connected with stems of pronouns as such.' E. g. *-(e)lo-*, *(e)ro-*, denoting agency or instrument, are connected with the roots **el* (Gk. *ἐλ-θεῖν*) 'to spring from' and **er* (Lat. *or-ior*, Gk. *ἐρ-χόμεναι*) 'to spring up' respectively. These roots developed still further into *-telo*, *-tel*, *-tlo* and *-tero*, *-ter*. A number of other suffixes are explained by a similar method, amongst others the suffixes *es*, *os*, 'occurring in nouns and in verbs in forming desideratives, the future and the aorist, as well

as the infinitive, Sk. *-sē*, Gk. *-σαι*, Lat. *-re*, are claimed to contain the root *es-* 'to be,' according to an abandoned theory of Bopp, which Wood now revives. In the prefixes, 'which are not easy to analyze and determine,' Wood believes that similar basal roots are to be found, though covered up. Hence all roots admit of being derived from monosyllabic roots beginning with a vowel. Eight such roots (viz. 1. \sqrt{es} 'to be'; 2. $\sqrt{*sē}$ or $\sqrt{*es}$ 'to be heavy'; 3. \sqrt{em} 'to bruise'; 4. \sqrt{es} 'throw'; 5. \sqrt{su} 'sound' connected with \sqrt{es} 'throw.' 6. \sqrt{su} 'to be hot,' probably related to 5; 7. \sqrt{en} 'to float, swim'; 8. $\sqrt{eu(e)}$ 'clothe') are followed through a large number of words. 'The comparisons might be extended, not only in these stems, but in others.'

The augment is taken by the author to be the vowel *e*, which was the initial vowel of most verbs; in present tenses it was dropped, because the accent was shifted to the defining element of the tense, that part which expresses present action [e. g. **(e)bhéro*], while in the past tense the accent remained on the initial vowel (**ēbhero-*), and finally this initial *e* was looked upon as the distinguishing mark of the past. The reduplication would then be simply a repetition of the root in its simple form, the vowel being generally *e*, the usual initial root vowel. The vowel-gradation series would have to be explained as originating from different suffixes, as Wood has shown to be the case with the O.N. forms *blōta* : *blēt* in a thesis published in the University of Chicago Germanic Studies, a method of explanation applicable to 'many verbs of the ablauting series.'

This article is continued in the fourth number of the Journal, pp. 441-70. In this second part the author discusses and traces through many forms the following roots: 9. $\sqrt{*ebh}$ 'rise,' which is found in a large number of roots beginning with I.E. *bh*; 10. \sqrt{er} 'to move, go'; 11. $\sqrt{el-}$, similar in meaning and development to *er-*; 12. $\sqrt{qel-}$ 'to set in motion,' from an original *qo* or *ego*; 13. $\sqrt{pel-}$, which is developed out of original *ēp*, used to express rapid motion of any kind; 14. \sqrt{per} 'to advance.' The principle upon which Wood proceeds in his etymologies and derivations is found in the following statement: "Wherever the root *qel-* occurs—and this applies to any other root—the presumption should be that it is in each case the same element. Those who deny this should prove it. Of course, exactly the same combination may originate from different elements, but such cases are comparatively rare. Therefore, when a certain root, or element, appears in words of widely different meaning, it is only necessary to show that one meaning may develop from another, in order to prove the possibility of connection." Wood sums up by saying that numberless examples might be quoted to substantiate his theory; that in analyzing forms and words the etymologist should proceed on the assumption that '*phonetically identical roots are one in origin.*' He holds that all the common elements which go to make up the I.E. languages have been

preserved, some forming the bases of what we call 'roots,' others forming suffixes. In the *Ursprache* there was a certain number of elements or roots, combined to a greater or less extent into words. "Each tribe took with it this common stock, and combined and recombined the roots as it had been accustomed to do or as it had need. Hence came overlappings of meaning, and occasionally one set of meanings in one dialect, and another in another."

Pp. 309-12. Francis A. Wood (Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa), I.E. *nr* and *nl* in Germanic. Through a large number of etymologies Wood deduces the principle that I.E. *nr* becomes (*n*)*dr* in Latin and Germanic as it does in Greek; while *nl* becomes medial *ndl* in Germanic and simple *l* when initial.

Pp. 312-34. Otto B. Schlutter (Hartford High School), On Old English Glosses, contributes a second article, which 'rescues' from the glosses forty-four additional words omitted by Sweet and discusses a number of others wrongly explained by the same author.

Pp. 334-8. Albert S. Cook (Yale University), Notes on the Old English Christ, proposes to retain the word *gefælsian*, v. 320, and translate it by 'pass through,' and in v. 952 to emend *fēore* and read *fīre* (Anglian for *fāre*), meaning 'fear.'

Pp. 338-41. Elisabeth Woodbridge (Yale University), An Unnoted Source of Chapman's All Fools, shows by comparing parallel passages that two characters in the play, Gostanzo and Valerio, with respect to their activity in the plot correspond to Chremes and Clitipho in *Heautontimorumenos* of Terence, 'considered with respect to certain phases of their characterization, they are to be referred to the Adelphi.'

Pp. 341-7. George Hempl (University of Michigan), G. *Skalks*, N.H.G. *Schalk*, etc., G. *Kalkjo*, O.N. *Skækja*, O.H.G. *Karl*, N.H.G. *Kerl*, *Kegel*, etc., connects these various Germanic words etymologically, showing the different phonetic changes and the causes of these changes, citing other analogous forms.

P. 347. Edwin W. Fay (Lexington, Va.) explains German *Gipfel* as a 'blend' of *Zipfel* with either *Giebel* or M.H.G. *Gupf* or both; and English *squawk* as a 'blend' of *squall* and *squeak* with a 'dash' perhaps of *quack*.

Pp. 348-60. Otto Heller (Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.), Goethe and the Philosophy of Schopenhauer, seeks to show three things. First, 'that these two thinkers held each other in exceedingly high regard; secondly, that in some important respects their world-views were strikingly alike'; and, finally, that in their lives and works there is evidence to prove 'that Goethe was one of the determinative factors in the construction of Neo-Pessimism.' Heller shows how Goethe and young Scho-

penhauer used to meet quite frequently in Frau Schopenhauer's home in Weimar, and proves the interest shown by Goethe in the career of the philosopher, and the respect and reverence the latter always felt for the poet. In a number of important features, e. g. their style of writing, their conception of the mission of art and philosophy, their view of the connection between art and science, their cosmopolitanism, the author demonstrates similarity between these great minds. Then, in more detail, by quotations from his works, by a certain passage in *Faust* (vv. 1336, 37) he seeks to establish the fact of Goethe's influence upon Schopenhauer's pessimistic view of life, and concludes: Goethe 'threw a strong ferment into the philosopher's mind,' 'provoking him into systematic opposition' by the optimistic views embodied in *Faust*.

No. 4.

Pp. 411-30. William Allan Neilson (Harvard University), *The Original of The Complaynt of Scotlande*. This work, written during 'the childhood of Mary of Scots' after the humiliating defeat at Pinkie and while the Protector Somerset was still pressing the 'bitter wooing' of the infant Queen for Edward VI, was borrowed in its general idea and also with many details of its allegory from '*Le Quadrilogue Invectif*' of Alain Chartier. This latter work was produced in France, early in the XVth century, shortly after the coronation of Henry VI as king and was intended to arouse the French to a sense of their shame. Neilson proves his assertions by a detailed comparison in parallel columns.

Pp. 430-41. William H. Hulme (Western Reserve University), *Malchus*, gives a reprint of this Old English text from the manuscript. It has been published before, but is not generally accessible; hence this reprint.

Pp. 441-70 contain F. A. Wood's second article noted above.

Pp. 470-75. George Hempl (University of Michigan), Germanic $\tilde{e}]^{nas.}$ = Old English \bar{o} and \tilde{a} ; and Vowel-shortening in Primitive Old English. Hempl discusses and explains the O.E. form **span-* by the side of **spon-* and *spôn*, which is an exception to Holtzmann's law that Gc. \tilde{e} before a nasal becomes \bar{o} in Old English, and formulates two principles to determine the real length of seemingly long vowels in O.E. "I. If the long vowel in question regularly underwent a certain modification (for example, that of \tilde{a} to \bar{o} before nasals), but in a particular case did not do so before two consonants, we have a right to assume that it had become short, and, if we find that there is nothing in the form to make this assumption impossible, we must recognize the shortness. II. If the long vowel in question suffers before two consonants a change that we know to be characteristic of short vowels only (for example, breaking), or permits a change (for example, the excrescence of a stop between two sonorous conso-

nants) that a long vowel would not permit, we cannot but recognize that shortening has taken place."

Pp. 475-7. Albert S. Cook (Yale University), *The Sources of Two Similes in Chapman's The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*. One simile occurring in act II, sc. 1 is traced to Catullus 22, and another occurring a little earlier is suggested by the Aesopic Fable 184.

Pp. 477-81. H. D. Blackwell (Yale University), *Middle English -wȝ-, -wō-*, contributes a number of additional illustrations to an article by George Hempl (*Journal*, p. 14 ff.).

Pp. 481-93. Max Batt (University of Chicago), *Schiller's Attitude towards the French Revolution*. Schiller was not an adherent nor even a friend of the Revolution, though he grew more and more interested, until in 1793 he proposed to write a defence of Louis XVI; from that time on his interest waned, though it did not cease altogether. Batt traces in Schiller's correspondence allusions to contemporaneous events, to books and notices treating directly or indirectly of France and its history and to conversations with people who had been to Paris and were passing through Weimar. 'As a public man,' he urges Körner 'to descant on the Revolution of Cromwell,' speaks favorably of Wilhelm von Humboldt's 'Ideen zu einem Versuch die Grenzen der Wirksamkeit eines Staates zu bestimmen,' and Dec. 21, 1792, announces his intention to write a public defence of Louis XVI, a plan not carried out because Louis was executed within a month. Batt agrees with Goedeke in thinking that the fundamental thoughts of this defence were the origin of the first letters 'Ueber die Erziehung des Menschen.' After the publication of the 'Aesthetische Briefe,' Schiller's interest in contemporaneous political events decreases, though he does occasionally refer to them. Quotations are given by the writer from many sources showing Schiller's unfavorable views of the Revolution and the reasons for these views.

The *Book Reviews*, which fill 97 pages (part 2, pp. 251-72; part 3, pp. 360-410; and part 4, pp. 493-521) are very carefully and well done, and cover a wide selection of recent works in the fields of general Germanic literature and philology.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

GUSTAV GRUENER.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. XXII.

L. Kellner. *Shelley's Queen Mab and Volney's Les Ruines*. Besides Holbach's *Système de la Nature* and passages in Godwin's *Enquirer* and *Political Justice*, which Shelley mentions in his notes, a more important source is Volney's *Les Ruines*. From the former *Queen Mab* derives its atheism, from the latter

a sort of deistic optimism. In some details also the influence is apparent. Thus Volney is carried from the ruins of Palmyra (cf. *Q. M.* II 109 ff.) far above the earth, that the Spirit may show him the Past, the Present, and the Future. In both poems we find the doctrine of Necessity, the horrid aspect of war, and the confusion of religions. The influence of Volney's Past and Present is especially marked, while traces of the second part of his work are visible in *The Revolt of Islam*, such as the description of the Future, and the last struggle of people with tyrants. Interesting parallels are cited from each poem.

Ph. Aronstein. *The Development of Local Government in England in the Last Decade (1885-95)*. Beginning with the establishment of counties (871-975), the paper mentions the Justice of the Peace and his constables, who, dating from 1360, had extensive powers of local management. In the 18th century the landed aristocracy gained ascendancy, while the middle classes withdrew from public life. The reforms which followed were reforms first of central government, then of local administration. The years 1832, 1867, and 1885 saw the suffrage made almost universal, though the new methods of administration, except for the schools, were strongly bureaucratic under the Local Government Board. Its service was salaried and devoid of personal interest in local affairs, and the middle classes still remained aloof from public life. The reform of administration came in the laws of 1888 and 1894. The number of counties was increased, and the new County Councils and County Aldermen manage the property as the Justices had done formerly. London was made a county and its administration was unified. The bill of 1894 went still farther in providing Parish Councils, Parish Meetings, and District Councils. The suffrage was extended to all holders of independent property, including women, servants, and farm hands. As a result of the contest with the lords, who were perverting the use of lands and driving the small tenants into cities, the parish has gained the right of renting single tracts of an acre under certain restrictions. The reforms show a new confidence in the masses, mark the abolition of the 'squirearchy,' and offer inducements to education for public life.

The reviews contain, among other notices, favorable comment on two American books, namely, Turk's edition of the legal code of Alfred and Emerson's *History of the English Language*. In commenting upon Ackermann's reprint of Chettle's *Tragedy of Hoffman* from the quarto of 1631, Sarrazin recommends reprints of only the classics which have linguistic or textual importance. Such editions as the present one are quite superfluous. Koch agrees with Westenholz, who, in his study, *Die Tragik in Shakespeare's Coriolanus*, opposes the theory that this tragedy was one of a proposed Roman trilogy. Lindner's study of Fielding's dramatic works shows that, in spite of careless workmanship, these may help to remove our misunderstanding of

'the age of enlightenment.' To a similar end the reviewer, Bobertag, cites Elwin's Commentary on Pope's Essay on Man. Fielding is influenced by Molière and the Spanish drama, but gives to all he borrows an English character. Kölbing, in his review of Hordern's edition of Byron's *Siege of Corinth*, supplements the editor's notes and adds new comments of his own.

The Miscellen contain a note on Byron's *Manfred*, in which drama the opening of II 4 and the Mont Blanc passage in I 1 are suggested possibly by Shelley's fourth letter to Peacock (Forman, VI 185 ff.). Shakespeare, *Timon*, IV 3. 438 ff. is referred to the *Anacreontea* 21 [19], Bergk's *Anth. Lyric*. The resemblance was noted by T. Moore in his translation of *Anacreon*.

R. Thurneysen. When did the Saxons come to England? The article is an extension of one in *Zeitsch. für Celt. Philol.* I 157 ff. According to the Gallic Chronicle for 409/410, Germanic tribes under the name of Saxons devastated the British coast at that time. As to the date of their landing Bede is usually followed, who names 449. Gildas, on whom he is thought to have relied, is indefinite, though he seems to put the date later than 446, and lived soon after the event. Two Continental writings point to an earlier date and their testimony is not necessarily contradicted. The Gallic Chronicle says that in 441/442 the Saxons conquered Britain after varying fortunes of war. The *Life of St. Germanus* (Act. Sanct. Jul. 31), in connection with Prosper Tiro, *Chron. min.* I 472, fixes the landing in 429. According to Nennius, *Hist. Brit.* 31 (ca. 679) and *Annales Cambriae* (954) it occurred in 428. These last sources, from internal evidence, seem quite independent of one another. The way in which the event is associated with Germanus' arrival in Britain, and his relation to Guorthigirn, implies different British traditions pointing to this one date (428). Having landed, then, at this date, by 441/442 the Saxons had overcome the British, who in 446, according to Gildas and Bede, appealed to Aetius, the consul, for aid.

F. Kluge shows traces of a French influence in proper names and other words of the *Ormulum*, which escaped the notice of Ten Brink and Morris.

The articles on Lord Byron as a Translator, by F. Maychrzak, are continued from vol. XXI, with abundant citations from the *Nisus*, the *Morgante Maggiore*, and the lesser translations, in parallel with similar passages from original works.

English Grammar receives a contribution from O. Schulze on the article before titled names and on the position of the genitive.

Kaluza reviews at some length Skeat's edition of Chaucer and commends it, adopting as a standard the previous editions of the poet, rather than the ideal edition. Of especial interest are

Kaluza's comments on Skeat's opinion of the authenticity of the Romaunt of the Rose.

Vol. XXII has given considerable space to reviews of helps and reports of the theories bearing upon the reform in the teaching of modern languages in Germany. Among the text-books reviewed are F. Schmidt's Text-book of Spoken English according to the Observation-Method, and J. Bierbaum's Text-book and Reader according to the Inductive Method (pp. 113, 115). The reviews on pp. 307 ff. illustrate the plan of providing reading-lessons drawn from English life and history. Mention should be made of Hartmann's pamphlet on the observation-method (p. 315). Among the Miscellen is a report of the forty-third meeting of philologists in Cologne, in which translation is not advised. Its substitute is dictation and written answers to French and English questions. Early reading-lessons are followed by oral and written reproduction of the subject-matter. Grammar is employed only as a reinforcement of knowledge already acquired, and it must be taught phonologically (p. 335).

A. Treichel. Sir Cleges, a Middle English Romance. Sir Cleges is an Arthurian story of the early 15th century, printed by Weber in his Metrical Romances, Edinburgh, 1810, but overlooked by Ten Brink and Körting, and briefly mentioned by Brandl (Paul's Grundriss, II 1. 697). Weber's only MS was in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh. Another, which is less accurate but more complete, has since been discovered in the Bodleian. Both are here printed in parallel. Sir Cleges having spent his all on Christmas entertainments, was mourning in his garden on Christmas eve, when he found cherries miraculously growing there. He started to bear a basket of the fruit to the king, but was intercepted by the porter, the usher, and the steward, each of whom detained him until he promised a third of his reward. From the king he then asked for twelve stripes, which were divided among the three officers, while Sir Cleges was restored to his old position. This episode has occurred frequently in story. Many instances are cited, of which the oldest is the Oriental story of Nasureddin. It is found also in Grimm's tales (7), in Wright's Selection of Latin Stories (VIII 122), and in the Old English Jest-Books. It forms the plot of a novel of Sachetti (195) and of the German poem on the parson of Kalenberg (late 14th century), and is one of the Nouveaux Contes à Rire (1702). Instances of similar motives are cited. The meter of Sir Cleges is the twelve-lined, tail-rime strophe, *aab ccb ddb eeb*, with slight variations. Most of the few assonances and impure rimes are due to the scribe. The alliterations are treated according to Regel's scheme. The rhythm, based only on the verses exactly corresponding in each MS, reveals occasional anacrusis, generally silent final *e*, and a weak plural ending *es* and final *er* before a vowel. The dialect is probably North-Midland.

A. B. Grosart. Was Robert Greene Substantially the Author of *Titus Andronicus*? The first point rests upon Ravenscroft's statement of a reasonable stage-tradition that the play was not Shakespeare's originally, but written by a private author and touched up by Shakespeare. Langbaine, Henslowe, and the Stationers' Register point to an edition of 1594, which Grosart considers identical with the play in the quartos of 1600 and 1611, doing away with the idea of two plays on this subject. He thinks that Henslowe's mention of a *Titus and Vespacia* does not refer to *Andronicus*, while the so-called German translation of an earlier *Andronicus* is but an adaptation of the play we know. Meres' mention of it as Shakespeare's is a result of his peculiar arrangement of titles, and the play appeared in the folio of 1623, because, as Ravenscroft says, the MS was in Shakespeare's hands. Of the internal arguments three are specified: (1) A turn of expression in *Andronicus*, II 1. 82, 83 occurs in Greene's *Planetomachia* (1585) and in his *Perimedes* (1588). (2) The repulsive subject and treatment are foreign to Shakespeare, but characteristic of Greene, especially in his *Selimus*, which Grosart considers the extreme example of this sort. Certain metrical and descriptive similarities are to be found, besides others illustrated by citations. (3) *Andronicus* contains frequent classical allusions of rather wide range, which is not characteristic of Shakespeare, and many favorite words of Greene occur, of which Grosart gives lists. In conclusion he cites passages to show the tempering hand of Shakespeare in the play.

Ph. Aronstein's article on the Reform of the Higher School-System in England is a summary of the Report of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education.

In the Miscellen K. Horst prints part of the remains of MS G of the Old English Annals, with a description.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD, JR.